



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PRIMITIVE NOTIONS OF THE "SELF"

By ARTHUR J. TODD, University of Minnesota

I. Anthropologists as well as students of religion have been until recently almost unanimous in pronouncing primitive men anthropomorphic. Especially is this true since the Spencerian view of the origin of the idea of soul and of religion has been coupled up with Tylor's theory of animism as the basis of primitive religion. But much evidence exists and more is constantly coming to light to show that Voltaire's famous aphorism about man conceiving God in his own image, while perhaps true enough of highly developed peoples, is only half true or wholly false when applied to more primitive men. The savage does not feel himself the capstone of creation nor the 'measure of all things.' The idea of his supremacy over the beasts and other men comes perhaps from revealed religion, but it also develops with a growing experience of men and things. At first, however, he conceives the equal if not greater importance of many of the things he sees around him, things which have their own lives, interests, politics, and even fetiches. Notice, for example, the important rôle of animals as Culture-Heroes and as Creators in primitive myth. In other words, if we conceive savage mind as zoomorphic we shall strike nearer the truth. The reason is precisely this: that primitive men have a very confused, ill-defined, hazy notion of their "persons," their "selves."

If it be objected here that savages have such a super-abundant sense of personality that they spill it over into the world of nature and work out vast animistic systems upon it, we simply reply that peoples standing low down on the culture-ladder are not strictly animistic, have only a vague, general notion of man's spiritual nature, and if they do project their images into Nature, derive only a nebulous sort of animism which is not really animism at all, but would better be called dynamism, energism, manitouism, or mysticism. It would not be difficult to show that many early travellers, discoverers and missionaries, on whom we must rely for much of our ethnographic material, projected their own preconceived notions of God, soul, spirit, into their interpretation of savage thought. For example, many of our North American Indians who were

set down as worshipping a "Great Spirit" had no real concept of a personal spirit. The missionaries caught part of the Indian idea of *manitou*, mysterious causal force, and personalized it as "Great Spirit." We shall offer further illustrations of this point later.

There is perhaps legitimate ground for making the philosophic distinction between personality and individuality. But since individuality develops first in the genetic order we are safe in saying that if the savage has but a vague sense of his physical individuality his notion of his 'person' is still more vague. That his sense of his physical self is vague cannot be doubted. Cuvier somewhere describes the first man as wandering about in ecstasies at the discovery of so many new parts of himself, till he gradually learns that they are not himself but things outside. Perhaps it is even truer that he regards integral parts of himself as things outside. This is a familiar phenomenon among lower animals. The cat plays with her own tail. My dachshund puppy worries his own front leg, bites it, groans, and apparently wonders why it hurts. Certain Euni-ceae (a group of Annelids) attaining a length of 1.5 metres bite the posterior extremity of their body without seeming in the least to feel it. For this reason apparently these animals voluntarily mutilate themselves when kept in captivity under disagreeable conditions.¹

The human infant is many months in establishing personal ownership of his fingers and toes. That the savage is often equally backward in identifying himself with his own physical organism and feelings comes out strikingly in an account of Kafir childhood.

"When a Kafir child has learned this first lesson (fear of fire) he has still much difficulty in recognizing the fact that his pains and aches arise within 'the frame that binds him in.' Take, for example, a headache. One of the most intelligent Kafirs I know told me that he could quite well remember his first headache during childhood. He said that he was conscious that something was wrong somewhere, but did not dream the pain was within his head. The pain might just as well have been in the roof of his hut as in the roof of his head; and it was only when his mother told him that his head was aching that the fact dawned upon him."²

¹ Ribot. *Diseases of Personality* (Open Court edition), p. 143, quoting Perrier, *Colonies Animales*. On the general obscurity of the term 'individual' among lower animals, see Ribot, *loc cit.*, 138-9; Espinas, *Sociétés animales* (2d ed.), Appendix ii; Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, 259-261.

² D. Kidd, *Savage Childhood*, 61-2. A public school teacher writes me that the same is true of many California children not entirely savage. "I've known," she says, "little chaps just beginning school to have 'an awful sore throat,' and then point to the region of the stomach for evidence."

Similarly the Lower California Indians in Father Baegert's narration could not or did not locate the trouble, when anything ailed them, but called every pain 'headache.' I am inclined to ascribe much of savage disease philosophy, not so much to a belief in evil spirits as causative agents (at least in the beginning), as to original failure to locate the seat of trouble in the sufferer's own person.

Such vague definitions of the physical "self" simply illustrate that lack of sharp dualisms which is the distinctive mark of primitive thought. It is difficult for a twentieth century Anglo-Saxon to seize and realize this primitive monism in all its comprehensiveness and vagueness. Perhaps I can best illustrate it from a symphony concert. If I can conceive myself as listener, music, orchestra, and conductor all in one, or interchangeable at will, then I have at least a glimmering of this phase of primitive mind. To a certain extent it is as guiltless of rigid dualism as the young child's mind, of which Professor Baldwin remarks:

"Such consciousness seems to lack dualisms. It has no depth nor polarity. It is innocent of the distinction between what is in consciousness and what is external to it (the dualism of "inner and outer"), of the distinction of the subject that thinks and of the thing it thinks about (the dualism of "subject and object"), of the distinction between one thinker and another (the dualism of "self and other-self"—"ego and alter")."³

From his experience with the Kafirs, Mr. Kidd concludes: "There seems to be a tendency in the primitive mind to assign internal or subjective agency to phenomena due to external causes, and conversely to attribute external agency to effects which are due to subjective or internal causes."⁴ Tylor states as a general principle that "even in healthy waking life, the savage or barbarian has never learnt to make that rigid distinction between subjective and objective, between imagination and reality, to enforce which is one of the main results of scientific education."⁵ Major Powell once declared that the confusion of confusions in the minds of non-civilized men is the confusion of objective and subjective. And it is to terms of such psychologic errors and confusions that Professor Lehmann reduces the whole of primitive superstition and magic.⁶ M. Lévy-Bruhl in his study of primitive mentality insists that savages do not conform to our logical discriminations between subject and object: "the primitive mind goes farther than merely to *represent* its object to itself: it *possesses* it and is

³ J. M. Baldwin, *Thoughts and Things*, i, 46. ⁴ *Savage Childhood*, 62. ⁵ *Primitive Culture*, i, 445. ⁶ *Aberglaube und Zauberei*, io, 316, 322, 324 ff., 537, etc.

possessed by it. It participates in it not only in the representative but at the same time in the physical and mystical sense of the word. It not only thinks it, it *lives* it." The identification or participation is so transfused with feeling, so imbedded in emotion, that it can hardly be said to be definitely thought.⁷ This mystic monism is nothing if not thoroughgoing and consistent. Hence for many savages there is no such thing as a natural set over against a spiritual or supernatural world; neither are there any such mutual exclusions as "waking" and "dream" world, sacred and profane, matter and mind, object-as-such⁸ and its properties or qualities.

In such a delightful yet at the same time miserably uncertain Alice-in-Wonderland world anything may happen; all things are possible. And this is precisely why even scientific observers with their concepts and categories make such a mess of interpreting primitive thought. Renan complains somewhere that we are wrong in applying our habitual methods to periods "wherein rivers have sons and mountains give birth." Professor Bain declares that "the leading fact in Belief according to my view of it, is our Primitive Credulity. We begin by believing everything; whatever is, is true."⁹ Raise this dictum to the *n*th power and you reach the catholic and elastic quality that stamps primitive mind. How will you classify a mind that believes a man can be born of a rock, or that stones and grass can talk, fire not burn, the dead be dead and alive at once, or that a village is the child of a town?

However it is to be classified, such a mind is not wholly irrational, even though it carries a larger dose of emotion than we deem proper for rational thought. It is thoroughly consistent, at least in the sense that it focusses on a life policy—the will-to-live. It is logical according to its own pragmatic unconscious formulation of logic, viz., a logic of use. For example, the Rev. J. Jette says of the Ten'a that they "have a wonderful faculty for believing or disbelieving what they choose. Their intellect seems to be altogether at their will's command, ready to give or refuse its assent according to the

⁷ Lèvy-Bruhl, *Les fonctions mentales dans les sociétés inférieures*, pp. 426, 67, 39, etc.

⁸ For example, among Australians: Spencer and Gillen (*Native Tribes of Central Australia*, 697), speak of certain geometric drawings on their *churinga*. "Thus for example a spiral or a series of concentric circles cut on the surface of a certain *churinga* will designate a *nyassa* (gum-tree); but an exactly similar design cut on another *churinga* will represent a frog." Cf. Parkinson, *Dreissig Jahre in der Südsee*, 621-7, 234-5. This same phenomenon may frequently be observed in children's games and drawings.

⁹ *The Emotions and the Will*, 511.

direction which it receives from the will. They never judge of the credibility of a report or statement on the merits of the case. . . . The ultimate reason which can be detected in almost every instance that really determines their belief is: what benefit shall accrue to me from such a belief?"¹⁰ We must remember that not only the Ten'a but also civilized men, all of us, see not with our eyes, and hear not with our ears: we see with what we have already seen and felt; we hear what we have heard and felt before.

We need not be surprised, then, to find these uncritical minds rejecting such trifling distinctions as that between belief and knowledge. Such a mind does not *believe in*, say, ghosts or dreams or metamorphoses: it *knows* them; they are perfectly valid, normal experience. Beliefs and superstitions arise only when experience is questioned, when categories of natural, supernatural, etc., are set up. But at first all is natural. Hence we must not be unprepared to find the savage defining his "self" in terms of his name, his shadow, his soul, his feces, exuvia, property, family, clan-group, or other, to us, incongruous things and relations. For all these are *natural* parts of his person in his conception of all as natural. Furthermore, the principle of *totum ex parte* is a fundamental principle of primitive thought. Applied to the concept of self, it has been stated thus: the personality of a being is indivisible and resides in its entirety in each of its parts.¹¹ Hence the extreme solicitude of certain tribes for the clippings of their hair, parings of nails, feces, etc. Hence also such customs as the secret name or the taboo on the shadow. With these general principles in mind let us examine a few illustrations of the various elements which enter into the savage's concept of his self.

II. The name has been almost universally conceived as part of the self. "For all practical purposes the Kafir thinks the name is the man."¹² The Eskimo of Angmagalik say that man consists of three parts, the body, the soul, and the name (atekata). The last enters the child when after its birth a sort of baptism is performed by rubbing water on its mouth and naming the name of the dead after whom the child is to

¹⁰ *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (hereafter abbreviated as *JAI*) xxxvii, 158-9.

¹¹ Hubert and Mauss, *Esquisse d'une théorie générale de la magie*, *Année Sociologique*, vii, 62. Lippert in his discussion of fetichism, especially the Royal Person as Fetich, and the statue of the god or king as fetich, states the same general principle. (*Kulturgeschichte*, ii, 438, 466 ff.)

¹² Kidd, *Savage Childhood*, 72.

be called. When a man dies the *atekata* remains with the body in the water, or in the earth until a child is named after him. It goes then into the child and there continues its existence.¹³ Sayce says of the Babylonians that name-giving was an important event in the child's life. "Like other nations of antiquity the Babylonians conformed the name with the person who bore it; it not only represented him, but in a sense was actually himself." A corresponding belief is hinted in the Chaldean oracle, "Never change native names."¹⁴ Closely connected with the name as self is the common belief in the 'power of the word' and the word as a person.¹⁵

The shadow as part of the self is almost equally common. "It strikes one as strange at first," says Miss Kingsley of the West African negroes,¹⁶ "to see men who have been walking, say, through forest or grass land on a blazing hot morning quite happily, on arrival at a piece of clear ground or a village square, most carefully go around it, not across, and you will soon notice that they only do this at noontime, and learn that they fear losing their shadow. I asked some Bakiwari I once came across who were particularly careful in this matter, why they were not anxious about losing their shadows when night came down and they disappeared in the surrounding darkness, and was told that that was all right, because at night all shadows lay down in the shadow of the Great God, and so got stronger. Had I not seen how strong and long a shadow, be it of man or tree or of some great mountain itself, was in the early morning time? . . . Murders are sometimes committed by secretly driving a nail or knife into a man's shadow, and so on;

¹³ Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, i, 218, after von Adrian and Holm.

¹⁴ Babylonians and Assyrians, 44. Similar evidence from other peoples: Mooney, *7th Bur. Ethnology*, 343, 352; Ellis, *Ewe-Speaking Peoples*, 98-9; Rivers, *The Todas*, 627; Chamberlain, *Things Japanese*, 4th ed. 344; Spencer and Gillen, *N. T. C. A.*, 227; Hill Tout, xxxv *JAI*, 152; *Jour. Asiat. Soc. of Bengal*, iii, 20; DeGroot, *Religious Systems of China*, i, 212; Levy-Bruhl, *Fonctions mentales*, etc., 45 ff.

¹⁵ Certain taboos on words, secret languages, use of formal prayers, rituals in archaic languages, inscriptions, spells, benedictions, curses, formulas, incantations, common in primitive life are expressions of the old belief that the description or mention of an act suffices both to produce it and its effect. "Speech if uttered in a whisper is breath, if spoken aloud it is body," said the Upanishads. (*Sacred Books of the East*, i, 231). Survivals of this ancient philosophy occur in contemporary religion. A Jesuit writer in *Contemporary Review* for January 1897 says: "Sacramental words according to Catholic doctrine, are words of power." Lafcadio Hearn has left a curious instance of the power of the word as a person. In old Japan the dragon-character once became an actual dragon. A man who had ridiculed the form of a certain character, likening it to a 'swaggering wrestler' awoke in the night under a terrible pummeling, only to find that the pummeler was the letter he had laughed at. A similar episode centers about a man who laughed at the rice-character. (*Glimpses of Unfamiliar Japan*, i, 32-3).

¹⁶ *West African Studies*, 176.

but if the murderer be caught red-handed at it, he or she would be forthwith killed, for all diseases arising from the shadow soul are incurable. No man's shadow is like that of his own brother, says the proverb." A high-caste Brahmin becomes unclean if the shadow of a man of lower caste falls upon him. Chinese burial ceremonials noted by De Groot illustrate the same sentiments. "When the lid is about to be placed on the coffin, most of the by-standers not belonging to the nearest kindred retire a few steps, or even make off for the side apartments, as it is dangerous to health and detrimental to good luck to have one's shadow enclosed in a coffin. . . ." "They now lower the coffin into the grave, the principal mourners wailing and stamping their feet an unlimited number of times." Most of the by-standers recoil a few paces lest their shadows should fall into the grave and harm thus be done to their persons. . . . The geomancer and his assistants are wise enough to stand on the side of the grave which is turned away from the sun."¹⁷ "A Kafir cannot always distinguish between himself and his shadow. Thus he is angry when a man—or even a child—stands on his shadow, for it is much the same thing as standing on his body. It will be observed that when a native approaches a number of men who are sitting down, he is careful to avoid treading on their shadows, or even tries to prevent his long shadow being seen in comparison with their short ones. This is especially the case with inferiors approaching their betters. . . . It is thought that a sick man's shadow dwindles in intensity when he is about to die, for it has such an intimate relation to the man that it suffers with him. . . . Native doctors apply medicine to people's shadows as well as to their bodies. . . . The shadow of a tree is said to feel the touch of the man's feet. And if the shadow of a tree is regarded as an organic part of the tree, how much more must the shadow of a man be considered to be a part of a man's personality."¹⁸

European folklore and mediaeval poetry reflect the popular superstitions regarding the shadowless man. Chamisso in his famous tale *Peter Schlemil* exploits these ideas. Schlemil barter his shadow to the devil for a magic purse of gold. He becomes forthwith an outcast through popular suspicion and fear of the shadowless man. He finds his shadow running loose one day in the woods, pursues and catches it, but is later compelled by the devil to relinquish it. Henceforth he must go without it for good and all. Cruikshank's illustrations show how a shadow may be detached, folded up or chased in quite the primitive fashion, and add strikingly to enforce the concept of the material substantiality of the shadow. (See the illustrated edition in Putnam's Ariel Booklets Series.) The play of present-day American school children indicates that these old ideas still survive in dramatic vigor. Many a child has been thrown into a paroxysm of fear and crying because a bullying comrade brutally stepped on his shadow.

¹⁷ Religious Systems of China, i, 94, 210, 211.

¹⁸ Kidd, *Savage Childhood*, 68, 70, 71.

Again, the image, "likeness" or picture, are identified with the self. To quote once more Mr. Kidd: "The raw Kafir has, as a rule, the greatest objection to having his photograph taken. He considers his 'likeness,' as he calls it, a part of his personality."¹⁹ I have encountered the same belief among certain Indians of Western Nevada. I asked the women to allow me to photograph themselves with their babies, but was refused, from fear that I would take away part of their "selves" in my little black box: by the principle of *totum ex parte* I might work magic on the part and hence injure the whole of their selves. I was more fortunate than some students in America and other parts of the world in not having my camera smashed for my pains. More than once Catlin had much difficulty in clearing himself of the charge of evil magic while painting his North American Indians, all on account of this notion of the image-self. The Mandans, he wrote, "pronounced me the greatest *medicine-man* in the world, for they said I had made *living beings*,—they said they could see their chiefs alive in two places—those that I had made were a *little* alive—they could see their eyes move—could see them smile and laugh, and that if they could laugh they could certainly speak, if they should try, and they must therefore have *some* life in them. The squaws generally agreed, that they had discovered life enough in them to render my *medicine* too great for the Mandans; saying that such an operation could not be performed without taking away from the original something of his existence, which I put in the picture, and they could see it move, could see it stir."²⁰

Survivals of this old belief in the image-self occur in certain modern religious customs—the icon; miracle-working pictures of the Virgin, of Christ, of the saints; medals, scapularies, images; and until recently processions with the banner of the Virgin and holy relics against siege and pestilence. In other words modern fetichism goes back to this old vague mystic definition of the "self." M. Lévy-Bruhl after citing a long list of ethnographic observations on the image-self, dismisses the notion that it is a result of puerile confidence in analogy, or of mental weakness and confusion, or of a naïve generalization from some animistic hypothesis. To the contrary, it is the result of *really perceiving* the object (*i. e.*, the self) in terms different from ours.²¹ De Groot finds the basis for such association of images with beings in suggestive shapes, analogous forms. "An image, especially if pictorial or sculptured, and thus approaching close to the reality, is an *alter ego* of the living reality, an abode of its soul, nay it is that reality itself."²² From Catlin's observations we gather that at least part of the ascription of life to a portrait is re-

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, 71.

²⁰ North American Indians, i, 107-8.

²¹ "Si les primitifs perçoivent l'image autrement que nous, c'est parce qu'ils perçoivent aussi autrement le modèle." (Les fonctions mentales, etc., 44.)

²² Rel. Syst. of China, iv, 340.

ferable to the optical illusion of its moving eyes. Hence the image-self is a real experience and not mere juggling with or "fudging" experience. It is warm and intimate reality, not wilful nor fantastic self-delusion.

In taking up the soul as part of the self we enter debatable land. I do not believe it is necessary for our purposes to plough extensively over this ground, except to remark that primitive men have no uniform concept of the soul. Its size, shape, number, functions and destiny vary from tribe to tribe. The origin of the concept of soul is likewise probably far from uniform. I have long questioned the all-sufficiency of the pathological swoon-and-dream theory. Nor has M. Durkheim's caustic critique of the Spencer-Tylor animism strengthened my faith in the older theory. Yet I have no substitute to propose except by way of suggesting that sufficient attention has not been given to certain normal psychologic processes from which the idea of a soul might easily have arisen. The common phenomenon of *auditory type of perception* and the inner voice that accompanies conscious thinking would seem to furnish materials readiest to hand for constructing the concept of a little man inside of us, of a guardian spirit, of a 'double,' of a 'soul.' When I (say in the character of an Australian black-fellow or Caroline Islander) think and hear the words of my thought ringing inside my brain-pan, what more natural than to conclude that this still small voice is a mystic somebody at once me and still different from my hands, my shadow, my property, and other parts of my "me?" This conjecture is at least plausible and has the merit of not attempting to derive the normal from the pathological. I should, however, by no means reject pathology as one probable factor in the evolution of the idea of the soul-self. Ribot cites a case from Dr. Leuret which shows how the notion of multiple souls might have arisen. A man convalescing from a fever "believed he consisted of two individuals, of which one was in bed, while the other walked about. Although without appetite, he ate a great deal, having, as he said, two bodies to feed."²³

Yet such discrimination could only occur where self-consciousness had attained considerable development. Hence we should not expect it from low grade peoples. The same might be said of the dream-self. I should offer the suggestion that instead of the notion of the 'double' originating in dreams, the dream-double would never have crossed the threshold of the savage's attention and interest until the concept of the

²³ The Diseases of Personality, 34-5.

double had already become pretty clearly defined. Furthermore, we must avoid allotting any special significance to primitive dream-life. For, as we have already seen, the savage makes no distinction between dream and waking life; both coalesce and both are equally valid.

But whatever the origin of the concept of soul, there is no questioning the identification of the soul or the dream-double as real parts of the self. The familiar reference of sickness or disease to mishaps suffered by the soul clearly indicates this identification. Some one steals my soul; I sicken; the medicine man hunts out the thief, recovers it and restores it to my "me;" this re-integration of my "self" heals me. My dream double goes wandering off o' nights and loses its way back; I sicken from the subtraction; the medicine man once more goes hunting and finds the errant part of my "me;" once more I am restored.²⁴ The important point here is the vital unity of the self even when it has been differentiated into a multiplicity of parts.

One of the most fascinating developments of the savage sense of personality is the identification of property as part of the self. A number of interesting problems cluster about the primitive attitude toward property. Is there such a thing as a sense-of-property? Why was the property of the dead destroyed or alienated? How does the distinction between real and personal property originate? If property is identified with self how shall we account for that state of economic communism which is well-nigh universal in rudimentary societies, and what does it argue about the concept of self? Our discussion must be limited to only a summary treatment of these problems.

In the first place, man as an object of natural history has incontestably an instinct for property; yet in the same sense that the amoeba has an instinct for property, and only in that sense. This instinct is simply the expression of the more general and fundamental will-to-live. But if we observe man as a member of human society the matter is by no means so clear; property here seems not to be rooted in mere love of possession. For we find the instinct modified, contravened, and even obliterated by other instincts and motives. What seems to be man's 'instinct for ownership' may frequently

²⁴ Many Old Testament references to the soul, quite apart from any mere verbal suggestion, appear to be pretty nearly upon this plane of thought. "He *restoreth* my soul," (Ps. 23); "The liberal soul shall be made *fat*," (Prov. 11.); etc. And later theology involving destruction of both soul and body sounds curiously like primitive beliefs about the "second death" of a material substance.

turn out to be in reality love of activity or of mastery. And the reason lies in just this fact, that he is member of a group, and that his self, which extends itself more or less consciously to property, takes on the color of his group surroundings and is modified by them.²⁵ Man in society is never fundamentally and inalterably egoistic, but is at once self and other-self, ego and alter, inextricably blended and interwoven. To forget this is to fall into a maze of fallacies surrounding the ancient problem of the relation of individual to society. The moment man attains *self*-consciousness he has emerged from natural history with its brute struggle for self-maintenance and its crass sense of property, and has become the center of those psychic and social forces which really create him *man*. "As a herd of individuals mankind would have a natural history as other animals have; but personality can only emerge out of intercourse with persons."²⁶ This intercourse with persons gives him in the most absolute sense his "me," including its expression in property and every other form. It is quite natural that with the attainment of consciousness of self, man should seek to enlarge his self-concept, to define it, in other words, to develop his individuality. But this does not necessarily mean to aggrandize his self at the expense of other selves in the group. The constant check upon any such impulse to aggrandize is furnished by the group consciousness of its unity. Consequently the individual self is subordinated to the interests of the group and takes its key and coloring from it. This is of course the secret of the tremendous power of the mores, traditions, folkways, and all that group of more or less unformulated means for social control, to say nothing of more highly developed institutions for control. It would seem then that the original biologic sense of property in its individualistic aspect may become and does become something quite different when the sense of self-as-a-social-being emerges. It is not necessary to state dogmatically that the more primitive a group, the more communistic it is, nor that communism in property was ever absolute and un-

²⁵ Take, for example, the matter of property in shelter. According to Fewkes (*Smithsonian Report*, 1910, p. 614), what led man originally to seek caves for habitation was "a desire for shelter from the elements, but not so much protection for himself as for others—for his offspring. . . . Their use for habitation was secondary, the primary motive being mainly altruistic, the same as that which leads the insect, bird, and mammal to make their nests." It is interesting to note that caves were likewise used for other distinctively *social* and *communal* purposes: burial, storing sacred paraphernalia, performance of sacred rites, etc.

²⁶ James Ward, *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed., vol. xx, p. 75, note.

compromising. It is sufficient to find communism in land, mines, food, etc., in every quarter of the globe to conclude that such men manifest an undeveloped non-militant sense of personality in property.²⁷ It goes to show that property as we have come to consider it is either an acquired characteristic (and as such modifiable), or a reversion to the crude sub-human instinct for self-maintenance at any cost.

On the other hand, since men are marked off from each other and do not coalesce in a gelatinoid mass, it is perfectly natural and altogether in keeping with group interests that their selves should tend to expression in purely *personal* property. Hence we find even in communistic groups private property in clothes, ornaments, trinkets or tools; and taboos to preserve their individual ownership. Thus the taboo is frequently the outward visible sign of the participation of such property in the owner's personality; hence its sacredness; hence its inviolability. This, too, probably explains at least in part the wide-spread custom of destroying the property of the dead. Such a principle eliminates many of the fantastic interpretations of the custom, which really explain nothing, and themselves require interpretation upon interpretation. Such, for example, the notion that a man's horse or house or widow or slave must be destroyed because of the dead person's covetousness or jealousy;²⁸ or that by smashing or burning a man's pottery, bows, spears, etc., their "souls" are released and enabled to accompany their late owner. These reasons may be given by savages who have forgotten the original significance of the custom. The more fundamental notion seems to be that property of the dead is not destroyed to *benefit him*, but *because it is he himself*, literally and absolutely. M. Lévy-Bruhl²⁹ applies the same reasoning to the taboos on widows between the 'first' and 'second' deaths of their spouses, though I confess that the principle of ghost avoidance may be in this instance nearer the truth. The

²⁷ "If the savage is incapable of conceiving the idea of individual possession of objects not incorporated with his person, it is because he has no conception of his individuality as distinct from the consanguine group in which he lives." (Lafargue, *Evolution of Property*, 18.) Cf. T. E. C. Leslie's introduction to Laveleye's *Primitive Property*, pp. xi-xii: "Property in the infancy of social progress consisted, one may say, simply in the feeling of unity and consequently co-ownership on the part of the men of a tribe, horde, clan, sect, or family."

²⁸ This does not deny that taboos and destruction of property of the dead are part of the general cult of avoidance and propitiation of ghosts and daemons.

²⁹ *Les fonctions mentales*, etc., 378 ff.

finesse displayed by modern Kafirs brings this identification of the dead man's property with his self into clear relief, and seems to justify our interpretation of mortuary destruction of property.

"If a Kafir should buy a blanket and coat and never use it before he died, then it would not be buried with him but would be passed on to the heir; if the man had worn it but once, and had soiled it with a little perspiration, then it would be buried with him. In this latter case it contains a part of his dirt and therefore a part of his personality. So with an assegai; the only part of the weapon that has the man's dirt ingrained into it is the wooden handle; this therefore contains a part of the man's personality and must be buried with him; but the iron point does not come into contact with the man, and so contains no part of the man's personality; therefore it needs but a ceremonial washing to make it the property of the heir."³⁰

Such a concept of the dirt-property-self marches along with and is perhaps a variant of the notion of the feces as part of the personality. Its connection with exuvial customs (preserving parings of nails, clippings of hair, etc.) is even more striking. The exuvial-self explains many exuvial sacrifices and exuvial fetiches.

We have already hinted several times in passing that the individual's sense of his own personal self is frequently subordinated to a mystical sense of the group personality, the larger self. We shall now see more precisely how this group sense acts upon the individual's definition of his self. To treat the matter thoroughly would require an elaborate review of the whole subject of primitive methods of reckoning kinship and relationship. We must confine ourselves, however, to bare indications of how these matters were conceived and felt. Primitive kinship, so it appears, rests originally on common work, common ownership, common food: in other words, on participation in common group activities and supplies. Blood relationship as we know it is certainly a derivative from this earlier (to us), conventional method of reckoning kinship. Two lines of proof exist: first, the reckoning of relationship outside the bounds of consanguinity; second, the ignorance of the process of human reproduction still to be found among certain tribes. Such institutions as the *couvade* and adoption are fictive devices indicating a transition period between an earlier vague definition of kinship and a more precise physiological concept of relationship.³¹ The general historic sequence of ideas concerning relationship is, first, that a child is related to his group, next to his mother and her kin but

³⁰ Kidd, *Savage Childhood*, 67.

³¹ For a detailed exposition of these points see the writer's *Primitive Family as an Educational Agency*, chap. iv.

not to his father, next to his father and his kin but not to his mother, and finally to both father and mother.³²

All these variations in the definition of kinship are at the same time variations in the concept of personality. We are interested particularly in that concept of kinship and of personality by which the individual is subordinated to his family or larger social group. It is immaterial to our purpose whether such a concept involves group-marriage or not. Nor are we required to accept such a literal view of 'collective parent-hood' as Professor Kohler sets forth.³³ Yet we must not be too hasty in rejecting such ideas as fantastic, for the human mind is infinitely credulous. Take, for example, the Kafir's notion of his group-self. "A Kafir feels that the 'frame that binds him in' extends to the clan. The sense of solidarity of the family in Europe is thin and feeble compared to the full-blooded sense of corporate union of the Kafir clan. The claims of the clan entirely swamp the rights of the individual. . . . The striking thing about this unity of the clan is that it was not a *thought-out* plan imposed from without by legislation upon an unwilling people, but it was a *felt-out* plan which arose spontaneously along the line of least resistance. If one member of the clan suffered all the members suffered, not in sentimental phraseology, but in real fact."³⁴ This intimate sense of group solidarity becomes translated into terms of individual personality; so we find that every true Kafir has two personalities: his *idhlozi* or individual, personal, inalienable spirit; and his *itongo* or ancestral spirit, which is not personal but tribal, and comes not by birth but by initiatory rites. To be without this clan or tribal spirit is the greatest calamity a Kafir can conceive. Such a man goes through life 'unprotected'; that is, his ancestral guardian angel is lacking, his self is dwarfed and truncated. In British Nigeria we are told that the individual

³² This is a modified expression of Lubbock's much debated dictum, in his *Origin of Civilization*, 3d ed. p. 149; repeated in *Marriage, Totemism and Religion* (1911), p. 52.

³³ Kohler in defending Morgan's theory of group marriage deduces the common occurrence of group kinship from primeval collectivity of women. Hence for the primitive man the group of women whom he calls 'mothers' form a real individual, a single personality endowed with a plurality of genital organs. Hence it is not surprising that he considered himself peculiarly related to this multiple personality. All of which would mean also that every child is *ours* to the collective-mother. (*Zts. f. Rechtswissenschaft*, xix, 171-188, 423-432; xxi, 252-267.

³⁴ Kidd, *Savage Childhood*, 15.

"is sunk in the family, village, or tribe."³⁵ Of our American Indians Bandelier says: "It may be said of the red man that he keeps secrets in the same manner that he lives,—namely in groups or clusters. The reason is that with him individualism, or the mental and moral independence of the individual, has not attained the high degree of development which prevails among white races."³⁶

The reasons for such subordination of the individual in both his actions and his thought of himself are to be found in the exigencies of self-maintenance and self-perpetuation, which for their successful issue have developed a closely woven fabric of community life. These conditions together with the ignorance and inexperience of primitive mind gave rise to that vague and unformulated philosophy of the self and men and things which might easily be called secular mysticism.³⁷ It is interesting to note that when this vague mysticism becomes differentiated into Sacred and Secular, the Here and the Beyond, and gods arise, these gods are at first *group* gods, not personal gods. The primitive Semites, for example, conceived their gods as caring only for the tribe and not for the individual.³⁸

Such group solidarity appears all the more strikingly in primitive notions of sin and its punishment. We must remem-

³⁵ Mockler-Ferryman, *British Nigeria*, 230.

³⁶ The Delight Makers, 13. Mr. E. J. Payne in his profound study of American aboriginal language discovered that the collective or we-form is the more common and the selective or I-form exceptional. "No more interesting illustration could be adduced of the sense of solidarity naturally pervading the food-group, and of the natural sense of weakness in its members individually." (*Hist. of America*, ii, 188.)

³⁷ "The primitive man can hardly have been definitely conscious of values which were not supported and shared by the group of which he was a part. A direct result of such a condition would be a vague, indefinite sense of his own personality. The group itself will not be analyzed, but will be conceived in the gross, as the universe in which he moves and has his being, as, in fact, identical with *himself*." King, *Development of Religion*, 66. This predominance of the group and group-feelings due to primitive notions of 'participation,' seems to be what James had in mind when he wrote (*Prin. of Psychology*, ii, 368, note), "In general it is probable that the consciousness of how we stand with other people occupies a relatively larger part of the mind, the lower one goes in the scale of culture."

³⁸ W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*. New ed. (1901), pp. 258 ff. This seems to be the religious expression of 'pessimistic evolutionism'; recall, for example, Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, lv:

"Are God and Nature then at strife,
That Nature lends such evil dreams?
So careful of the type she seems,
So careless of the single life."

ber that primitive sin was wholly an objective or ritualistic breach, and not a sense of ethical shortcoming. Precisely because it was objective and because of the close-knit life of the group in other respects, the sense of sin became, too, a group-sense. Hence the breach of any member of the group involved the whole. Ten righteous men might have saved Sodom, but the un-rightness of one would have sufficed to bring down its destruction. This sense of group responsibility is the source of a tremendous sanction for discipline and right conduct. It gives to taboos their inviolability.

The story of a three years' famine in Israel during the reign of David illustrates these points. (ii Samuel, ch. xxi.) Saul had slain certain Gibeonites contrary to treaty. Years afterward the famine ravaged. David enquired of the Lord. The Lord explained the affliction of the nation as resulting from "Saul and his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites." The Gibeonites demanded blood-revenge—the hanging of Saul's seven sons. This was granted, and the seven were hanged "in the hill before the Lord." Evidently this wiping out of seven guilty individuals squared the accounts of the whole group and pleased the tribal god, for we are left with the impression that all went well afterwards and that the famine was raised. Similarly, violation of a taboo by an Eskimo brings punishment upon the whole group. An Eskimo hunter must avoid contact with corpses or bleeding persons. For the souls of sea animals are quick to detect these contaminations and evade the hunters. If a hunter has had the ill luck to do either of these things he must at once avow it. "If he does not do so he will bring ill luck to all the hunters. . . . The transgressor of a custom is distasteful to Sedna and to the animals, and those who abide with him will become equally distasteful through contact with him. For this reason it has come to be an act required by custom and morals to confess any and every transgression of a taboo, in order to protect the community from the evil influences of contact with the evil-doer. The descriptions of Eskimo life given by many observers contain records of starvation which, according to the belief of the natives, was brought about by some one transgressing a law and not announcing what he had done."³⁹ Death, according to Thonga belief, is both cause and result of group contamination; and a village in which it occurs cannot come back to the ordinary course of life without a special collective purification.⁴⁰ The Colonial Puritans had this group sense of sin highly developed. In the early 18th century we find Judge Sewall, one of the witch-baiters, making his confession of penitence for his judicial acts in that unhallowed business; he asks for the prayers of the brethren that God may "not visit the sin of him or of any other, upon himself, or any of his, nor upon the land."⁴¹

This subordination of the individual's sense of self to that of the group is still further illustrated by certain primitive

³⁹ Boas, *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, 57: 627; cf. in general, Lippert, *Kulturgeschichte*, ii, 497; F. Justi, *Geschichte des alten Persiens*, 199.

⁴⁰ Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. i, p. 152.

⁴¹ Weeden, *Economic and Social History of New England*, i, 421-2.

beliefs regarding reincarnation, family-totems, etc. The Egyptian Book of the Dead speaks of a period "when Horus came to light in his children."⁴² A Maidu legend (California) tells of the miraculous birth of Oan-koi-tu-peh, whose sire was the Red Cloud. The Red Cloud told the young mother: "Whenever you see him think of me. This boy has no life apart from me; he is myself."⁴³ An Irish manuscript of the 11th century relates a similar notion regarding the great hero Cuchulainn. The men of Ulster took counsel about him, fearing his early death; they "wished to give him a wife that he might leave an heir, for they knew that his re-birth would be of himself."⁴⁴ The laws of Manu express the same belief: "The husband, after conception by his wife, becomes an embryo and is born again of her."⁴⁵ A corresponding Hindu ritual required the father to address a new-born babe thus: "From limb by limb thou art produced; out of the heart thou art born; thou indeed art the self (âtman) called son."⁴⁶ Among the Aruntas of Australia every individual is a direct reincarnation of an ancestor of the mythical alcheringa period or of some totemic animal of that period.⁴⁷ I have reserved as a final illustration of the identification of the individual with his family some remarkable cases from northern China. Mr. Johnston, who relates these incidents, encountered them as actual problems in the course of his daily affairs as a judge in China:

"The Weihaiwei farmer has indeed so limited a conception of his own existence as a separate and distinct personality that in ordinary speech he continually confuses himself with his ancestors or with living members of his family. Examples of this are of repeated occurrence in the law-courts. "I bought this land and now the Tung family is trying to steal it from me," complains a petitioner. "When did you buy it?" asks the magistrate. "Two hundred years ago," promptly replies the oppressed one. Says another, "My rights to the property of Sung Lien-têng are being contested by my distant cousin. I am the rightful owner. I buried Sung Lien-têng and have charge of his soul-tablet and carry out the ancestral ceremonies." "When

⁴² Book of the Dead, c. 112, transl. Renouf, in *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xvii, 8; Budge's translation of this chapter renders the idea thus: "Then the company of the gods, who were among the divine followers of Horus when he existed in the form of his own child, etc."

⁴³ S. Powers, *Tribes of California*, *Contrib. to N. A. Ethnology*, iii, 299.

⁴⁴ Kuno Meyer, *Archeol. Rev.* i, 70.

⁴⁵ Sacred Books of the East, xxv, 329; xii, 334. An echo of this oriental belief perhaps occurs in Nicodemus' question about rebirth.

⁴⁶ Sacred B. of the E. xxx, 211; cf. a passage in the Brihadâranyaka-Upanishad (Sacr. Books, xv, 96).

⁴⁷ Spencer & Gillen, *N. T. C. A.*, 202-4, 169-70.

did Sung Lien-têng die?" questions the magistrate. "In the fortieth year of K'ang Hsi," is the reply. This means that the deceased whose property is in dispute died childless in 1701, that plaintiff's ancestor in that year defrayed the funeral expenses and acted as chief mourner, that by family agreement he was installed as adopted son to the deceased and heir to his property, and that plaintiff claims to be the adopted son's descendant and heir. Looking upon his family, dead and alive, as one and indivisible, he could not see any practical difference between the statement that certain funeral rites had been carried out by himself and the statement that they had been carried out by a direct ancestor. . . . Another litigant, whose long residence abroad had had no apparent effect on his general outlook on life, came to me very recently with the complaint that on his return from Manchuria he had found his land in the possession of a neighbor. "I went to Manchuria as my family had not enough to eat," he said. "I came home this year and wished to redeem the land I had mortgaged before I went away. But I found it had already been redeemed by my neighbor, a cousin, and he refuses to let me redeem it from him." On being asked when he had mortgaged his land and emigrated, he replied: "In Chia Ch'ing 3"—that is, in 1798. He was merely identifying himself with his own great-grandfather. . . . In another case a man whom I will call A brought a plaint to the effect that he wished to adopt B, and that C for various reasons refused to allow this adoption to take place. On investigation it turns out that B is dead and that it is his infant son D whom A really wishes to adopt. B and D—father and son—seem to A merely different expressions, as it were, of the same entity. This does not mean, of course, that supposing B were still alive it would not matter whether B or D actually became A's adopted son. The rules of adoption in China are strictly regulated. A man cannot adopt any one he likes. Not to mention other necessary conditions, the person adopted must belong to the appropriate generation, that is, to the generation immediately junior to that of the adopter. In the case before us the infant D belonged to the proper generation, and his father B could not have been adopted. To our notions it seems all the stranger that A, knowing this, should have spoken of B when he meant D; yet this manner of speech is exceedingly common." The writer then goes on to show further evidence that the individual is not regarded as an independent unit, citing the restrictions placed on the powers of the individual to dispose of real property.⁴⁸

At this point it may be of interest to note that mere birth does not always confer personality upon the infant. Frequently it must be achieved through rites and ceremonies. Thus among the Bayaka a boy has no personality distinct from his father's until circumcision.⁴⁹ In British Central

⁴⁸ R. F. Johnston, *Lion and Dragon in Northern China*, 139-41. Added light is shed upon such phenomena by Mr. Tao's explanation of ancestor worship. It did not originate, he claims, "from the dread of ghosts, nor is it an 'animistic lottery' for securing material welfare or advantage. Ancestor worship is rather the expression of an instinctive craving to trace the origin of the self." *Sociological Review*, vi, 51.

⁴⁹ Torday and Joyce, xxxvi *JAI*, 42.

Africa a new-born infant is not regarded as an individual, as a person, until it receives at least a portion of its mother's personality in the shape of nourishment.⁵⁰ Among the Giliaks of Saghalin Island new-born children for some time are not differentiated into 'boys' and 'girls.'⁵¹ Among the Zuñi Indians Cushing tells us that "when a Zuñi woman is about to give birth she is, if possible, retired into a room of "sacred enclosure." The entrance and windows of this room are carefully screened with blankets, and over or on the entrance way, whether door or sky hole, a plume of warning, or taboo, is attached so that none but the appointed may enter. Here the child must remain until the morning of the tenth day after birth. For as yet it is not born into the world of men. Nine days, representing the months of its gestation, are required for its formation and "hardening" as a human being, against all malign influences. For it is supposed by them that during the period of this formation, the child is, as were all beings of creation when the world was new, *kyai-u-na*—unripe and susceptible, impressionable even as are the grains of growing corn when in milk" . . .⁵² Many other curious birth customs probably owe their origin to similar beliefs. Collateral evidence of the child's supposed lack of personality may be deduced from primitive infanticide, child sacrifice, and child cannibalism. Another line of evidence is suggested from West Africa, where death is usually considered to result from sorcery and where sorcerers are hunted out and killed: it is significant that no such pursuits follow the death of a child, a slave, or a person of no consequence.⁵³

III. We have seen how according to primitive philosophy a man acquires his self, and how he may lose part or all of it. Now we must turn to observe how he can change it. In brief, we shall examine the doctrine of metamorphosis in its relation to the concept of self. This will necessitate a momentary return to the savage's general philosophy of nature. We suggested a while ago that this philosophy was altogether too vague to be termed definitely animistic, and suggested mysticism, dynamism, etc. The truth is that to the primitive mind the world and its events were fluid, changeable, capricious, not to be caught and held in fixed and hard categories.

⁵⁰ Werner, *British Central Africa*, 103.

⁵¹ Piludski, *Anthropos*, v, 756-74.

⁵² Primitive Motherhood, 30-1. (In *Proc. 1st Cong. of Mothers*, Washington, 1897.)

⁵³ Levy-Bruhl, *op. cit.*, 325, after Nassau.

The only universal laws were, first, that all is possible; second, that all is related; third, that all changes.

The first 'law' is too obvious to require illustration. The second, the law of relation, or participation (mystic symbiosis, as M. Lévy-Bruhl puts it), is not a definitely reasoned pantheism, but a vague emotional feeling of community, based upon a failure to mark off the various kingdoms and forces of nature.⁵⁴ Here fusion and identity, and not difference or separation are significant. Men and all other things swim in a sort of 'imponderable ether, that fills all space, rigid as adamant, but infinitely elastic,' etc. Such a vague comprehensive concept gives the basis for and expresses itself in various forms of magic, divination and religion: such as fertility rites, food-increase dances, magical communication of powers and qualities by contact. In terms of personality the concept finds its expression as the human self in direct contact with mysterious impersonal force, permeated by it, communicating it. Hence we get the notion of a person as 'mana,' 'orenda,' 'wakanda' or 'manito;' that is, as emanating or manifesting a peculiar quality or power. Thus chiefs, strong men, certain plants, animals, inanimate objects or natural forces are said to have *mana*. This must not be confused with 'possession' by familiar spirits or geniuses. It is rather a manifestation of vague pervasive vital force. The words denoting it are used sometimes as adjectives, sometimes as substantives, and may be rendered as power, strength, mystic, terrible, sacred, secret, remarkable.⁵⁵ It is all of these and more. Like many other primitive concepts this almost baffles attempts to translate it into modern logical thought or speech. But this much is certain: it denotes a vital pervasive compelling force in primitive thought. And the phenomenon is so widespread that one is almost justified in pronouncing it a universal stage in the evolution of human thought, a stage anterior even to the soul or double. Observers have noted it throughout Indian America, in Melanesia,

⁵⁴ For example, the Yakuts think fire is a *fussy old man*, always whispering and shuffling—a personality to be coddled. Recall that as late as the 13th century Pope Calixtus excommunicated a comet; and that frequently in the middle ages grasshoppers and other animals were gravely interdicted in courts of justice!

⁵⁵ "The idea seems adequately expressed by our term 'wonderful.'" (Boas, article 'Religion' in *Handbook of American Indians*.) But Hewitt says: "Those who interpret these terms as denotive simply of what is expressed by the English words 'mystery,' 'immortal,' 'magic,' 'sorcery,' or 'wonderful,' fail to appreciate the true nature and functions of the assumed power denoted by these terms as conceived by the Indians." (*Handbook of Amer. Ind.*, article 'orenda.')

among the Maori, in Africa.⁵⁶ The Fêng-Shui of the Chinese and the Virtue of classic antiquity and primitive Christianity are survivals of the same thought.⁵⁷ This is not exactly fetichism in the modern sense of fetich as the dwelling place of a definite spirit, but it is no doubt the broad base from which fetichism sprang. It is also the very stuff and methodology of magic, and, as Halliday suggests, for the very reason that personality is so widely and vaguely conceived. The magician works by his *mana* or *orenda*, that is, by 'contagion of qualities'; union or contact with power becomes in this way the foundation of both magic and religion; for "the wide area of personality as it is conceived in the lower culture, enables persons quite easily to be united or brought into contact with power."⁵⁸ Frazer's great collection of facts clustering about the tree-spirit, the king-priest-god-'vegetation-spirit,' who is killed annually, illustrates how this primal notion of the sensitive community between men, animals and cosmic powers animated both oriental and classical religion and myth.⁵⁹ It may also be said to survive in Christian ritual and tradition. The 'pathetic fallacy' of forcing Nature's moods into accord with those of suffering gods and heroes is as old as literature and still remains a trump card for the melodramatist or the romantic novelist.

⁵⁶ See, e. g. Dorsey, *11th Bur. Ethnol.*, 494, 467, 432-3, 365; McGee, *15th Bur. Ethnol.*, 182; Miss Fletcher, xxvii, *JAI.*, 437; *id. Proc. Amer. Soc. Adv. Sci.*, 1897, 326; Spencer & Gillen, *N. T. C. A.*, 548, note; *id. Northern Tribes*, 629; Holles, *The Masai*, xix; Codrington, *Melanesians*, 118-9; Cambridge Exp. to Torres Straits, vi, 244-5; Hubert & Mauss, *L'Année Sociologique*, vii, 101 ff, 108 ff, 118, etc.; Hartland, *Man*, Mar. 12, 1912, p. 45; Lovejoy, *Monist*, xvi, 357-82; Hetherwick, xxxii, *JAI.*, 93-5; Jones, 'The Algonkin Manitou,' *Jour. Amer. Folk-Lore*, 1905, 183-91.

⁵⁷ For example, 'Virtue had gone out of him,' (Mark, v, 30; Luke, vi, 19, viii, 46, etc.); cf. also the Virtue in relics of saints and heroes. The visitor to the church of St. Etienne du Mont in Paris during the feast of St. Genevieve will see hundreds of persons still practising the doctrine of *mana* at the saint's shrine. A handkerchief or rosary becomes magnetized, as it were, by exposure to the saint's body or by touching her tomb.

⁵⁸ *Folk-lore*, xx, 147-67.

⁵⁹ Dr. K. Th. Preuss at the International Cong. for History of Religions at Leiden 1912, supported with great force this primitive notion of a 'magical unity.' The nearest relations as members of a group, he thinks, were regarded as a magic unity, corresponding to the tendency to regard groups of external objects such as the starry heavens, clouds, various forms of fire, an animal or plant species as a magic unity—of which at the same time each specimen represents that unity. In the light of what we know now of magic this seems clear enough. But we fail to see quite so clearly as Dr. Preuss seems to, how exogamy is derived from it by a natural process.

The third primitive law or principle, viz., that all changes, is simply a corollary to the one we have just considered. For if all is fused and undifferentiated in nature and there are no metes or bounds to the powers of men, animals, stones, and other members of this cosmic democracy, then it requires no stretching of the mind to conceive stock doing duty as stone, man becoming animal, or animal and stone giving birth to man. All barriers are down and the self so fluid that *this* can become *that* and *the other* at will. Abundant evidence is at hand to prove that this view of primitive sense of self is not fantastic nor exaggerated. We have already said that savage mind is rather zoomorphic than anthropomorphic. This is clearly brought out by von den Steinen:

"To understand the way of thinking of the Indians we must throw aside entirely our notions of the division between man and other animals. A medicine man understands all the languages of beasts, birds and fishes. They have no notion of any ethical humanity. Being good and bad is only doing pleasant or unpleasant things to others. Abstract notions of good and ill, uncontrolled by fear or reward are wanting. The animals differ only in having no tools. Hence men arise from arrows and women from maize pestles. The Indian does not say "I am a man, and I think of the animals as acting like men." On the contrary men are thought of as animals, both in the good and bad sense. The tribes identify themselves and each other with animals. Some animals are also thought of as being the lord of particular plants, such as tobacco, cotton, mandioca, and other animals as lords of sleep or of the hammock, or of the jars filled with water. In fact, the Indian received the most important parts of his civilization from those persons whom he called animals. He owes to them the teeth, bones, claws, shells which he uses as tools and weapons. He is indebted for what he can do to the animals, his neighbors. Why should he not attribute to them the other things whose origin he does not know? The animals have not got those to-day because man has taken them away."⁶⁰

The Tarahumares of Mexico, according to Lumholtz, feel that the animals are in no wise inferior to man, that they understand magic, know many things and can aid the Tarahumares in making rain. Similarly it is stated that a Bushman questioned by a missionary "could not state any difference between a man and a brute—he did not know but a buffalo might shoot with bows and arrows as well as a man, if it had them." "When the Russians first landed on one of the Alaskan Islands the people took them for cuttle fish 'on account of the buttons on their clothes.'" ⁶¹ "Some of

⁶⁰ Shingu Tribes (Berlin Museum, 1888), p. 351.

⁶¹ Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii, 108, note. Cf. Lubbock, *Marriage, Totemism & Religion*, 108-9, for sense of brotherhood between Peruvians and certain fish; also Hose & Macdougall, xxxi, *JAI*, for relations between men and animals in Sarawak. This zoomorphic

the Ainos believe themselves to be descended from a bear and call themselves after it."⁶² Among the Aruntas in a certain totemic ceremony an individual figures apparently indiscriminately as the rat-man or man-rat.⁶³ The Trumai of Northern Brazil say that they *are* aquatic animals. The Bororo boast that they *are* red paroquets. This does not mean merely that after death they will be transformed into paroquets, nor that paroquets are Bororos metamorphosed. Steinen says expressly (even though he refused at first to believe it), "the Bororos give it out coolly that they *are actually* paroquets (arras) exactly as if a caterpillar should say it is a butterfly."⁶⁴ It is not a name they adopt, nor is it a fancied relationship; it is an essential identity. And the same mental process no doubt holds in most totemic systems. This identification of primitive men with stocks and stones, with their totemic plants and animals, must not be thought of, however, in physiologic or structural terms, but rather in spiritual terms; that is, spiritual in the primal vague, loose sense. The identification consists in the fact that both are emanations or manifestations of a common energy or spirit behind all things. It is indeed a sort of pantheistic communism. This explains why, for example, the Bororos can actually think themselves paroquets even while they have no feathers and cannot fly.⁶⁵ It further explains the fact that such 'community' between men and animals does not stop there but may be extended to directions, localities and qualities; for example, to points of the compass, seasons, winds, colors. Hence probably the significance of orientation of graves, buildings, prayers; though such customs may also result from ancestor worship or the grave-cult. Hence, too, such 'sympathies' as the Baganda believe exist between a barren wife and the soil. A sterile Baganda woman may be repudiated because her sterility communicates itself also to her husband's garden.⁶⁶ Similarly in

tendency still lingers in modern thieves' slang. For example leather = skin; muffle or snout = face; bec or beak = mouth; wing = arm; flipper = hand. For a curious confirmation of zoomorphism from prehistoric archeology see Luquet, *L'Anthropologie*, xxi, 409-23.

⁶² Lubbock, *op. cit.*, 109, citing Rev. J. Batchelor.

⁶³ Spencer and Gillen, *N. T. C. A.*, 231.

⁶⁴ Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens, 305-6.

⁶⁵ Cf. Lévy-Bruhl, *op. cit.*, 100 ff; Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, i, 191, 250. Jones in the article already referred to says that the Algonkins conceive of *manitou* as an objective presence, with the quality of self-dependence, without form or feature, "The most common experience seems to be that of being overwhelmed by an all-encompassing presence."

⁶⁶ Roscoe, xxxii, *JAL.*, 38, 56.

Japan only a young man is allowed to graft trees "because the graft needs all the vital energy possible."⁶⁷ A Welsh poem of the 12th century contained a sentiment to the effect that with false kings come failure of crops, bad years, and long days. Pokorny cites an example from the old Irish "Book of Leinster": under Cairbre Cinnchait who gained his throne by violence and caused the children of the nobles to be put to death without pity, each ear of corn bore only a single grain, each oak only one acorn. But when the old dynasty was restored Ireland regained her wonted fertility.⁶⁸ It is quite probable that many royal taboos (as Frazer and others have suggested) arose from this belief in sensitive relationship between man and nature.

To the set of ideas centering around this primitive communism between men and other creatures belongs the widespread custom of tracing tribal or family descent from plants, animals or inanimate objects. As we have already treated this subject elsewhere in considerable detail⁶⁹ it will be necessary here to cite only a few illustrations.

Bantu folk tales describe prehistoric times when human and lower animals were supposed to associate in marriage.⁷⁰ In the 59th Rune of the Kalevala (the story of the virgin Marietta), it is expressly stated that she conceived by a mountain berry:

"Marietta, child of beauty,
Thus became a bride impregnate,
Wedded to the mountain berry," etc.

Later she gave birth to the child in a 'woodland manger' after a long series of painful adventures. In the same Rune the child is spoken of as follows:

"Since the child is but an outcast,
Born and cradled in a manger,
Since the berry is his father," etc.

In China, a young widow claimed to have had a child by the clay statue of her dead husband.⁷¹ The Indians of the Northwest claim descent from certain animals: "Francois is a member of that sept of the StsEelis whose remote ancestor was an otter. So I sought to learn from him whether they looked upon the otter as their relatives and paid regard to these animals by not killing or hunting them. He smiled at the question and shook his head, and later explained that although they believed their remote ancestor to have been an

⁶⁷ Chamberlain, *Things Japanese*, 449.

⁶⁸ *Mittheil. d. Anthropol. Ges. in Wien*, xxxviii, 34-45.

⁶⁹ Primitive Family as an Educational Agency, ch. iv; here will be found also illustrations of the converse phenomenon, viz., animals springing from human beings.

⁷⁰ R. H. Nassau, *Where Animals Talk*, 165.

⁷¹ De Groot, *Relig. Syst. of China*, Bk. ii, (vol. iv), 342-5, cites this and other similar cases.

otter they did not think it was the same kind of otter as lived now. The otters from which they were descended were otter-people, not animals, who had the power to change from the form of men and women to those of the otter. All the animals in the old time were like that, they were not just common animals and nothing else; they were people as well, and could take the human or animal form at will by putting on or taking off the skin or other natural clothing of the animal."⁷²

Now we come to still more specific examples of how nature's barriers are let down in primitive thought. Under the general term metamorphosis we shall include transformations of things into other things, things into persons, persons into things, persons into other persons.

A curious creation myth of the Mewan Indians illustrates the first phase of metamorphosis. After O-let-te and Wek-wek had created mankind, O-Let-te said to Wek-wek, "Now we also are going to change; I am going to be a hunting animal and you are going to be a hunting bird." . . . So O-Let-te the Coyote-man, whose form up to this time we do not know, changed to the Coyote, a furry hunting animal. And Wek-wek changed to the Falcon, a hunting bird."⁷³ Even more striking is a myth from the Huichols of Mexico, according to which the wheat was at one time a deer.⁷⁴

The old Greek legend of Pygmalion may be matched with many instances from modern ethnography to illustrate the second phase. In China statues of men and animals are believed to transmute themselves into real human beings.⁷⁵ And a similar belief has been observed among our North American Indians. Lafcadio Hearn recounts a Japanese legend of somewhat like tenor. "Also in those days there appeared in many provinces a Buddhist priest of giant stature, whom none remembered to have seen before and whose name no man knew, traveling through the land, and everywhere exhorting the people to pray before the bell of En-gaku-ji. And it was at last discovered that the giant pilgrim was the holy bell itself, transformed by supernatural power into the form of a priest. And after these things had happened, many prayed before the bell, and obtained their wishes."⁷⁶

C. H. Harper, writing of totemism among certain Gold Coast tribes, says: "I have heard the story of a hunter who killed a deer and part of the body turned into a human being before it expired, but I believe it is a mere legend."⁷⁷

European fairy lore with its tales of frog-princes, raven-princesses and the like furnishes parallel instances. In old German folklore the stork and human beings were commonly interchangeable by metamorphosis. New England witch-baiters were equally credulous. In the trial of the Indian woman Titiba, accused of witchcraft, it trans-

⁷² C. Hill Tout, xxxiv, *JAI.*, 335-6. This citation is particularly valuable because of Mr. Tout's qualifications and scrupulous care as an ethnographer.

⁷³ Merriam, *The Dawn of the World*, 87.

⁷⁴ Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, ii, 45.

⁷⁵ De Groot, *op. cit.*, ii, 340-55.

⁷⁶ *Glimpses of Unfamiliar Japan*, i, 68.

⁷⁷ xxxvi, *JAI.*, 186.

pired that the devil appeared now as a tall man of Boston, now as a hog, now a great dog, a black dog, a man who threatened to hurt her; also apparently on occasions as a black or red rat. So far as the records show she was believed by her judges! The Egyptian belief that Ginnees (daemons) assume animal forms, notably cats and dogs, is another variant of this general belief. Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones which became living men is perhaps an echo of it; and the dogma of literal transubstantiation as held by certain portions of Christendom is certainly a survival of it. Perhaps here should be reckoned also such crude 'miracles' as the liquefaction of St. Januarius' blood.

The myths of Proteus, of Apollo and Daphne, the legend of Circe and her pigs,⁷⁸ and the well-nigh universal belief in were-wolves typify the metamorphosis of persons into things. Lot's wife is a familiar case in point. A curious variant of the Protean legend occurs in the folklore of the Golds (eastern Siberia). Fuji changes herself into a needle, a worm, a drop of blood, a gadfly, a skunk, and so on almost *ad infinitum*.⁷⁹ Puck in *Midsummer Night's Dream* is one of the same brood. Shakespeare's catalogue of his threatened metamorphoses reads like a chapter in folklore. Ellis states that among the Yorubas, "a belief in metamorphosis is universal, and is not limited to a change to an animal form, since men and women are sometimes transformed into trees, shrubs, rocks, or natural features. The shrub *bujo*, whose fruit is used to stain the skin in imitation of tattoo marks, was a Yoruba belle of that name, who was metamorphosed. . . . The Iyewa lagoon is also said to have been a woman."⁸⁰

Lane reports an Egyptian belief in the metamorphosis of alum into human form, which is used as a charm against the evil eye.⁸¹ Amongst the ancient Scandinavian peoples the most powerful form of magic was the ceremony of the *Seid*: in the course of it a woman could sometimes, while lying on a platform in the center of the group, change herself into another shape, often that of an animal, go to other cities and see what was happening there. If she were injured or killed during this period her body showed the marks.⁸² The Kafir, says Mr. Kidd, "makes many strange but picturesque mistakes in localizing the 'self' . . . he is at such an elementary stage of thought that he imagines he can by magical charms, change himself into a wild animal and devour human beings, and then by magic transform himself back again into his original human shape."⁸³ The Malays have a tale of how a noted magician (a fishing-wizard) dived into the sea and became the porpoise; also of a child who fell into the river and became a crocodile.⁸⁴ Among the Serbs, at least until recently, it was commonly believed that people could be transformed into trees and plants, and conversely that human souls might be extracted from plants.

We are not concerned with the origins of the belief in wer-beasts,

⁷⁸ Cf. the parallel superstition cited by Lehmann: "Die thessalischen Weiber konnten durch Salben Menschen in Tiere oder Steine verwandeln." (Aberglaube und Zauberei, 50.)

⁷⁹ Laufer, *Amer. Anthropologist*, ii, n. s., 331-8.

⁸⁰ Yoruba-Speaking Peoples, 123.

⁸¹ Manners & Customs of Modern Egyptians (Everyman's ed.), 256.

⁸² Lehmann, *op. cit.*, 78.

⁸³ Savage Childhood, 66.

⁸⁴ Skeat, *Malay Magic*, 308-9, 283.

but only with that aspect of it which indicates a vague definition of the "self;"⁸⁵ hence a few typical cases will suffice. Among certain Gold Coast tribes members of the leopard family in particular believe that if the funeral custom is not well performed the deceased turns into a leopard and destroys the farms. Whenever a member of the family eats a plant called *susna* he turns into a leopard. Again, if the family do anything in violation of the dead man's wishes he will turn into a leopard and plague them; "the founders of the different tribes believed that a man could change his form after he is dead and take that of his sacred animal."⁸⁶ This case involves a particular sort of metamorphosis, viz., metempsychosis, complicated with totemism. Somewhat more characteristic is the Yoruba hyena superstition. A man may assume that disguise at night to prey upon sheep and cattle and, if opportunity offers, upon human beings. "Such man-hyenas are believed to be able, by means of certain howls and cries to compel people to go out to them in the dark forest to be devoured. A similar belief is found in Abyssinia."⁸⁷ Among the Nagas of Eastern Assam there is a belief in tiger-men. "These tiger-men, who are in league with the demons, are also fortune-tellers, and are much feared. They have the power of changing themselves into tigers and in this manner revenge themselves upon an enemy by killing him and his pigs and his cows. When they wish to change back into men, the tiger-man's wife must throw her clothes over the tiger's head, and at once he will change back into his human form."⁸⁸ Recently among the Ekoi of Southern Nigeria a chief fell under suspicion of having, in the guise of a wer-leopard, killed several cows and goats. The town was about to rid itself of him summarily when a white man arrived and put a stop to the proceedings. Among the same people Chief Agbashan is a mighty elephant hunter believed to have the power of changing himself into an elephant.⁸⁹ The metamorphosis of twins into cats by night is a superstition reported from southern Egypt.⁹⁰ So firmly is the wer-beast fixed in folk-mind that it expresses itself in children's play. Thus a favorite game of boys in the Malay Peninsula is the *Hantu musang* (civet-cat demon), in which a boy is "hypnotized" and "turned temporarily into such a beast by possessing him with the 'hantu of the musangs.'" If kept so for an hour there is danger of his becoming a real musang!⁹¹

About the metamorphosis of persons into other persons clusters a variety of beliefs and customs involving witchcraft, daemonism, mortuary rites, initiation ceremonies, the 'changing,' the 'fountain of youth,' etc. Perhaps of all these the renewal of youth is the simplest and most naïve. For ex-

⁸⁵ Yet in passing we might suggest that Lippert's theory of metamorphosis into were-wolves as a survival of ancient cannibalism is, to say the least, fine-spun, and a capital instance of bending facts to fit a general hypothesis.

⁸⁶ Harper, xxxvi, *JAL.*, 182.

⁸⁷ Ellis, Yoruba-Speaking Peoples, 122-3.

⁸⁸ Furness, xxxii, *JAL.*, 465.

⁸⁹ Talbot, *Nat. Geogr. Mag.*, xxiii, 34.

⁹⁰ A. M. Blackmar, "*Man*," x, 25-9.

⁹¹ J. O'May, Playing the wer-beast, *Folk-Lore*, xxi, 371-4.

ample, in the Tauna Islands (New Hebrides) it is believed that in the olden times people could cast their skins and become young again.⁹² Hence the Middle Age legends of the Wandering Jew, and of Joseph of Arimathea who subsists for centuries by the possession of that supreme relic, the Holy Grail, are not purely local Christian myths. The Yorubas have a belief corresponding somewhat to European changing tales. In one version a nine months old infant grows up to a big boy and eats all the food the minute his mother is out of the house; and changes back to his infant form when anybody appears. The natives ascribe such a phenomenon to spirit possession. It is really referable to uncertainty about the 'self;' for, as we have already seen, the Yorubas also believe in wer-beasts and other phases of metamorphosis. Ellis refers to the "Father of Eighteen Elves" in Arnason's collection of Icelandic legends for similar stories.⁹³

In all times one of the prescriptions of divinity or magic has been power to transform the 'self' of mortals. Thus Athene changed Ulysses into a beggar.⁹⁴ And one of the most hateful powers of Middle Age witchcraft was the ability to change a man into a maid, or *vice versa*. Divine power and magic could confer invisibility also by metamorphosis; but such metamorphoses were usually only a temporary device, unaccompanied by any real change in the person. Yet the fact that by donning a Tarnhelm one could see and not be seen still further illustrates primitive notions of the protean elasticity of the self. Initiation into the calling of magician or into a savage secret society was usually accompanied by a change in personality. Thus in West Africa the youth who is a candidate for initiation into the secret society is isolated and subjected to strict discipline, the whole purport of which is his death to the old life and resurrection to a larger life. He becomes a new man; even his name is changed; sometimes he learns a new language; he forgets or pretends to forget all his past life, even the commonest details of manners and customs; sometimes he must be taught even to walk and to eat.⁹⁵ In view of such qualities of mind as we saw in the

⁹² Gray, *Intern. Archiv. für Ethnographie*, vii, 232.

⁹³ Yoruba-Speaking Peoples, 120-1.

⁹⁴ *Odyssey*, xvi, 194 ff.

⁹⁵ Similar customs in New South Wales, Queensland, Fiji, Congo Basin, New Guinea, Cerain, India, etc. See Lippert, *Kulturgesch.* ii, 341-2; Frazer, *Golden Bough*, ii, 342-57; *id.*, *Totemism & Exogamy*, i, 43-4; Chevrier, *L'Anthropologie*, xvii, 372-3; Kulischer, *Zts. f. Ethnologie*, xv, 194 ff; Bentley, *Life on the Congo*, 78 ff; Lawson, *Hist. of North Carolina*, 381.

Bororos, I am not sure we can call such customs *pretending* at all: the emotional coloring to belief may here easily beget a real experience of transformation, the birth of a new 'self.' Jones in the article already cited on the Algonkin Manitou shows clearly how just this emotional coloring *socially produced* determines the notion of the person in contact with that great vague but pervasive power in extension of the person which we have noted under the term manitou, mana, and the like.

Much more difficult of interpretation are cases of primitive impersonation. We are always at a loss to know how much is mere mimetic and how much genuine transformation into the part played. Take, for instance, a case from modern Servia. Prince Lazarovich-Hrebelianovich speaks of a curious invocation of the "Dodola," the mystic demi-goddess, personified by a gypsy girl, in whose keeping are the waters of springs and streams.⁹⁶ Or again a case from India:

"On the death of a Dewan or of a priest a curious sport is customary at the funeral. The corpse is conveyed to the place of cremation on a car; to this car ropes are attached, and the persons attending the ceremony are divided into two equal bodies and set to work to pull in opposite directions. One side represents the good spirits; the other the powers of evil. The contest is so arranged that the former are victorious. Sometimes, however, the young men representing the demons are inclined to pull too vigorously, but a stick generally quells this unseemly ardor in the cause of evil."⁹⁷

Here in this crude sort of morality play there seems to be a survival of old notions of interchange of personality between men and good or evil powers. The obvious display of sympathetic magic may easily reach back to more primitive notions of contact with that vague impersonal energy or *mana*.

From modern Russian ethnography comes a description of a Mordva burial custom which even more clearly illustrates the realistic interchange of personality:

"The funerals wind up with a feast, songs, and sometimes dance. At harvest they leave on the field some bits of unharvested grain for the dead. There is a memorial of the dead on the 40th day especially, and frequently later. On the night before the 40th day, they clean up the house, repeating, "The father is coming, he will scold us." Early in the morning a person of the same age as the deceased goes to the cemetery; the others go to the courtyard where the ox destined for the memorial awaits his destiny; they make obeisance to

⁹⁶ The Servian People, i, 75-6. The Dodola, he says is "certainly a survival from remote pagan times, when the children of men were the children of nature and felt themselves in very near communion with the trees and hills and the forces of sun, wind, and water."

⁹⁷ Lewin, Wild Races of S. E. India, 185.

him to the waist; the women cover his horns with a cloth or bunch of grass; then they begin to lament, bowing to the ground before the ox. The ox led to slaughter represents the deceased. He is slaughtered by the nearest relative of the deceased, and cooked in a kettle with clear water. . . . After slaughtering the ox, they go into the cottage, where some prepare the meal for the expected guest, and others spread out on the lavka the clothing left behind by the deceased, in such a way as to represent a human figure . . . [then follow details of the feast preparations] . . . having prepared all that and lamented over the representation of the deceased, the nearest relative gives to all a cup of vodka or beer and invites them to go for the deceased. The guests make a deep obeisance, take the clothing, and with lamentation, go out into the procession. When they reach the grave they all fall down upon it, kiss the ground, and call the deceased. Then the Mordvine who had been sent out thither early in the morning speedily presents himself amongst the weeping relatives; the whole company flock about him with shouting, put upon him the clothing which they have brought, and taking him by the hand lead him back to the village. There they give him the lighted candle; they open the doors of the cottage; all make obeisance to the threshold and lead the pretended deceased with respect into the cottage, where they seat him in the front corner; the master or mistress of the house gives him a cup of vodka, or beer, and while he drinks all kneel before him on one knee, bending down their heads and leaning on the floor with one hand; then the master of the house entertains the guest. During this the guests go in turn to the pretended deceased, bow to him with reverence, and ask him about life in the other world. He offers each a glass of beer and gives them all reports about their relatives in the other world; thus: Yours has grown poor by spending; Yours keeps bees; Yours has become a drunkard; Yours has gone on a journey for his health. After the feast, they light a candle, around which the women stand and begin to weep for the guest, wishing that he may have light; then the company escort the guest to his own place. When they come to the cemetery, they take the clothing off him; thereupon he loses his fictitious character and sits down with the rest around the food which has been brought."⁹⁸

It is said that the origins of Greek drama are to be found in ancient mimetic tomb-rites. They were probably of just the Mordva or even cruder type at first, and gradually, through aid of masks and other fictive means, attained independence and established themselves as a conventionalized art. Indeed probably all dramatic art rests on just such a realistic base, and gains, or at least gained its power from the *real transformations* ascribed to the actors' personalities. In the tomb ceremonies the living are conceived as investing themselves with the personality of the dead. But in the case of the Servians the person represented was conceived as living. Hence, in view of what we have already seen of primi-

⁹⁸ Russian Ethnography, 274 (transl. by W. G. Sumner in Mss. note); cf. Abercromby, Pre- and Proto-historic Finns, i, 177-8, quoting Smirnov.

tive thought, it is not difficult to conceive of 'mimetic identification' between the living and either the living or dead. Of course it is difficult to determine just how much is realism and how much only make-believe; but we may venture to say that at some time or other concrete realism predominated. It is significant that even in Plato's day philosophers could fear the metamorphosis of the actor into his rôle.⁹⁹

It may not be out of place here to recall to mind such modern survivals of belief in metamorphosis as the change in personality of the priest when he dons his ecclesiastical vestments, the judge when he puts on his robe and mounts the bench, the convert when he claims "entire sanctification," the dogma of papal infallibility resulting from a mysterious interchange of personality between the pope and the Godhead; or finally the policeman when he lays aside his humanity and his citizenship to become the 'personification of the law,' and tells you with shocking naïvete that he tortures a suspected prisoner with the 'third degree' not as a man but as an officer!

IV. Widely scattered and unpromising as the materials may have seemed at first sight, they have yielded several important suggestions on the historical side of "human nature." In the first place we must have been impressed by the large rôle of the feelings in coloring primitive perception and especially the perception of the "self." This emotional coloring taken together with ignorance of the scientific order of nature expresses itself in a vague mystic outlook on nature in relation to the human self not very different from that expounded by Emerson in his *Essay on Beauty*.¹⁰⁰ The lack of sharp dualisms in primitive thought, in spite of the apparent absurdities to which it leads, may turn out to be not so absurd after all; especially the failure to distinguish rigidly between *ego* and *alter*. As an aspect of this primitive monistic thinking we must not fail to note its subordination of the individual self to that of the group. This we found reflected

⁹⁹ E. g. Plato, *Republic*, Bk. iii (Jowett): "the same person will hardly be able to play a serious part in life, and at the same time to be an imitator and imitate many other parts as well . . . human nature, Adeimantus, appears to have been coined into yet smaller pieces, and to be as incapable of imitating many things well, as of performing well the actions of which the imitations are copies."

¹⁰⁰ "Men hold themselves cheap and vile; and yet a man is a fagot of thunderbolts. All the elements pour through his system: he is the flood of the flood and fire of the fire; he feels the antipodes and the pole as drops of his blood: they are the extension of his personality."

in primitive communism and in those broad definitions of kinship which indicate the merging of the individual into the totem-clan, Cult-Bund, or other group; and as a resultant, closely knit group solidarity. It appears, too, that the notion of the individual soul and its priceless worth came only long after the general sense of the 'self' as a member of human and cosmic society. Furthermore, we seem justified in concluding that the militant sense of self-as-property is a characteristic lacking in primitive men; that it is a characteristic acquired in the course of comparatively recent industrial evolution; hence, that it is modifiable. As to the possibility of modifying the human self, the widespread belief in metamorphosis seems to yield emphatic affirmation and is too deep-seated to be utterly repudiated. The phenomena of religious 'conversion,' of 'double personality,' of hypnotic suggestion, or of even more normal and commonplace educational experiences indicate that it may still retain a valid place in our thinking. Could we once peer into the depths of that dim valley, the subconscious self, we might well be startled at the undreamed-of possibilities of transformation and metamorphosis. But the final and most important conclusion from the ethnographic data we have gathered is that the sense of self is essentially social and that as the mind is a working unity, so the concept of self reflects this totality of mind—feelings, ideas, desires, percepts, concepts; and is controlled, shaped, and colored by it.